

Remarks

Claims 1-5, 7-8, 12-31 are pending. Claims 6 and 9-11 have been canceled. Claims 28-31 have been added. Entry of the amendment is respectfully requested. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Objections

The claims 1 and 21 have been amended as requested by the Office.

The Rejections

Claims 1-2, 12-19, and 21-23 were rejected as anticipated pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Graef (US 4,494,747).

Claims 1-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beskitt (US 6,302,393) in view of Graef.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections. The references, whether taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the recited invention.

Graef Does Not Anticipate The Claims

Inventor Graef is fully aware of his Graef patent. It doesn't anticipate the claims.

Claim 1

Graef's thickness gauging roller (47) does not constitute a second stripper, as alleged by the Office. First, one skilled in the art understands what constitutes a sheet stripper. Secondly, Graef teaches that the roller (47) (freely) rides in a feed roller groove (41) (col. 8, lines 52-53; col. 9, lines 4-5). Graef also teaches that "doubles or even more than two notes" are moved past the roller (47) (col. 9, lines 13-15). Where does Graef teach that roller (47) provides stripping resistance to movement of the first sheet in the first direction?

Additionally, the roller (47) is not “nonaligned” with the recess (41). Graef specifically teaches that the roller (47) is aligned with the recess (41). Graef states that “rollers 47 are . . . opposite the flat feed roller grooves 41” (col. 8, lines 38-40); “rollers 47 riding in . . . the feed roller grooves 41” (col. 8, lines 52-53); and “rollers 47 ride in the feed roller grooves 41” (col. 9, lines 4-5). It follows that Graef’s thickness gauging roller (47) cannot constitute the second stripping portion. Nor can Graef anticipate claim 1.

Claim 21

For reasons already discussed (e.g., claim 1 remarks), Graef’s thickness gauging roller (47) doesn’t constitute a second stripper, as alleged by the Office. Where does the roller (47) provide stripping resistance to sheet movement?

Additionally, Graef indicates that his invention relates to ATMs for “dispensing” currency notes (col. 1, lines 22-27). Where does Graef teach “receiving a stack” in a chute of an automated banking machine? Graef doesn’t anticipate claim 21.

Claim 28

For reasons already discussed (e.g., claim 1 remarks), Graef’s thickness gauging roller (47) doesn’t constitute a contact stripper roller. Nor does Graef teach the different timing of stripping resistance by a non-contact roller and a contact stripper roller. Where does Graef teach a non-contact stripper roller and a contact stripper roller arranged so that the non-contact stripper roller provides the initial stripping resistance? Graef doesn’t anticipate claim 28.

**The Claims Are Not Obvious Over
Beskitt in view of Graef**

The Action relies on Beskitt for teaching an ATM that can accept deposit stacks using an escrow and delivery mechanism (32) and an unstack mechanism (34). The Action (on page 4) admits that Beskitt does not teach or suggest the “sheet engaging and feeding steps claimed by Applicant”. The Action alleges that Graef teaches these steps, and that it would have been obvious to have modified Beskitt to have used Graef’s “more reliable and economical” sheet picker arrangement.

The Applicants respectfully disagree. Beskitt lacks more features than the Action admits. For example, Beskitt doesn’t teach or suggest a picker member recess; a first stripping member *and* a second stripping member in opposed alignment with a picking member; and the different timing of stripping resistance by a non-contact stripper roller and a contact stripper roller.

Nevertheless, for the many reasons already discussed, Graef doesn’t teach or suggest the recited features, relationships, and steps. Thus, Graef can’t be relied upon to alleviate the admitted and further noted deficiencies in Beskitt. The Office has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Nor has the Office explained how Graef’s picker arrangement for note *dispensing* could be used to pick notes from a stack deposited in Beskitt. It would not have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have modified Beskitt as alleged to have produced the recited invention.

The Dependent Claims

Each of the dependent claims depends directly or indirectly from an independent claim. Thus, it is asserted that the dependent claims are allowable on at least the same basis. Furthermore, each dependent claim additionally recites specific features and relationships that patentably distinguish the claimed invention over the applied art. The references do not teach or suggest the features and relationships that are specifically recited in the dependent claims. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claims are further allowable due to the recitation of such additional features and relationships.

No Additional Claim Fee Needed

No additional claim fee is deemed required. Four claims have been added, but they replace four canceled claims. Only three independent claims are pending.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance.

The undersigned is willing to discuss any aspect of the Application by telephone at the Office's convenience.

Respectfully submitted,



Ralph E. Jocke Reg. No. 31,029
WALKER & JOCKE
231 South Broadway
Medina, Ohio 44256
(330) 721-0000